

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRANDEN WILLIE ISEL,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
JEFF LYNCH,  
Respondent.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01220-JDP (HC)

**ORDER**

GRANTING PETITIONER'S  
APPLICATION TO PROCEED *IN FORMA*  
*PAUPERIS* AND DIRECTING THE CLERK  
OF COURT TO ASSIGN A DISTRICT  
JUDGE TO THIS ACTION

ECF No. 2

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

THAT THE PETITION BE DISMISSED AS  
SUCCESSIVE AND UNAUTHORIZED

ECF No. 1

OBJECTIONS DUE IN FOURTEEN DAYS

Petitioner, a state prisoner, brings this action under section 2254. ECF No. 1. It appears, for the reasons stated below, that this petition is successive and unauthorized. I recommend this action be dismissed on that basis. If petitioner does, in fact, have authorization to file a successive petition or if other reasons militate in favor of this case proceeding, he may state as much in his objections. Additionally, I will grant his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. ECF No. 2.

1 The petition is before me for preliminary review under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing  
2 Section 2254 Cases. Under Rule 4, the judge assigned to the habeas proceeding must examine  
3 the habeas petition and order a response to the petition unless it “plainly appears” that the  
4 petitioner is not entitled to relief. *See Valdez v. Montgomery*, 918 F.3d 687, 693 (9th Cir. 2019);  
5 *Boyd v. Thompson*, 147 F.3d 1124, 1127 (9th Cir. 1998).

6 Petitioner filed this petition challenging convictions for attempted murder with  
7 premeditation and first-degree murder handed down in San Joaquin County superior court. ECF  
8 No. 1 at 2. It appears that these convictions were previously challenged in a federal habeas  
9 petition that was filed in this court on August 22, 2022 and denied on the merits. *See Iseli v.*  
10 *People of the State of California*, No. 2:22-cv-01483-TLN-EFB, ECF Nos. 1, 23, & 31.  
11 Accordingly, this petition is successive. *See Cooper v. Calderon*, 274 F.3d 1270, 1273 (9th Cir.  
12 2001) (“Generally, a new petition is ‘second or successive’ if it raises claims that were or could  
13 have been adjudicated on their merits in an earlier petition.”). Under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A),  
14 a petitioner may not bring a second or successive habeas petition seeking the same, previously  
15 denied relief unless he obtains proper authorization to do so from the court of appeals. *Id.*  
16 (“Before a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court,  
17 the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district  
18 court to consider the application.”). The current petition does not indicate that such authorization  
19 has been obtained. Accordingly, I recommend this action be dismissed. As stated above, if  
20 petitioner does have authorization from the court of appeals, or if some other ground justifies this  
21 case proceeding, he may state as much in his objections to these recommendations.

22 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 23 1. Petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is GRANTED.
- 24 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to assign a district judge to this action.


25 Further, it is RECOMMENDED that the petition, ECF No. 1, be DISMISSED as  
26 successive and unauthorized.

27 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
28 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days of

1 service of these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the  
2 court and serve a copy on all parties. Any such document should be captioned “Objections to  
3 Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations,” and any response shall be served and filed  
4 within fourteen days of service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file  
5 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *See*  
6 *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir.  
7 1991).

8  
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: August 17, 2024

  
JEREMY D. PETERSON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE